

REDMOND PLANNING COMMISSION

Sherri Nichols, Chair | Judy East, Vice-Chair Roy Captain | Aaron Knopf | Vidyanand Rajpathak Denni Shefrin | Aparna Varadharajan

MINUTES

REDMOND PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING Wednesday, September 22, 2021 - 7:00 p.m.

1. Call to Order & Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chair Nichols.

Commissioners Present: Chair Nichols, Vice-Chair East, Commissioners Captain,

Knopf, Shefrin, and Aparna

Excused Absence: Commissioner Raj

Staff Present: Jeff Churchill, Glenn Coil, Kim Dietz, Beckye Frey, David

Lee and Sarah Pyle, Planning Department

Recording Secretary: Carolyn Garza, LLC

2. Approval of the Agenda

➤ MOTION to approve the agenda by Commissioner Knopf. MOTION seconded by Commissioner Captain. The MOTION passed unanimously.

3. Visit from Redmond Mayor Angela Birney

Mayor Birney stated that all Boards and Commissions are being visited this fall to say thank you to members and staff as well as to answer any questions.

Vice Chair East asked about plans going forward during the COVID pandemic. Mayor Birney explained transitions that have been made and that will be kept in some form such as online meetings.

Commissioner Knopf asked about the feedback being received from citizens regarding how COVID has stressed or brought the community together. Mayor Birney replied that Redmond is between 95-98% vaccinated, setting the tone for how the city can serve the

September 22, 2021

community. Citizens have stepped up with programs such as food boxes and fundraising for families in need. The community will hopefully find commonalities even if all protocols are not agreed on.

Commissioner Aparna thanked Mayor Birney for joining the Climate Mayors Alliance and asked what the Redmond vision moving forward should be. Mayor Birney replied with details regarding maintaining a sustainable high-quality water supply.

Commissioner Captain stated that the city is well-managed and there is pride in the people who contribute. Mayor Birney thanked all who contribute and specifically mentioned the exceptional staff.

4. Items from the Audience

No written comments, no requests to speak.

5. Redmond Zoning Code ReWrite Phase 1 and Zoning Code Amendments 2020-2021: Continue Public Hearing and Study Session. Planning Commission to continue a public hearing from the September 8, 2021 meeting and seek continued identification and resolution of key discussion topics.

Attachments: Memo, Attachment A - Issues Matrix, Attachment B - Public Comments,

Presentation

Staff Contact: <u>Kimberly Dietz</u>, Principal Planner 425-556-2415

<u>Cameron Zapata</u> , Senior Planner	425-556-2411
Niomi Montes de Oca, Senior Planner	425-556-2499
<u>Andrea Kares</u> , Planner	425-556-2480
Scott Reynolds, Planner	425-556-2409
Sarah Pyle, Planning Manager	425-556-2426
David Lee, Planning Manager	425-556-2462

Staff Presentation

Ms. Dietz presented a slide overview.

Public Hearing

> Chair Nichols re-opened the Public Hearing (continued from September 8, 2021).

Ms. Katie Kendall, McCullough Hill Leary, stated that the code should be as clear as possible for the development community and provide a strong platform for future code amendments within Redmond 2050. Amendments should not affect pending projects that have relied on staff determinations on the current code. All concerns have been addressed by staff and Ms. Kendall stated looking forward to collaborating with staff and the Commission to continue to refine the code toward Redmond 2050.

September 22, 2021

Ms. Dietz summarized written comments received. An additional comment from Ms. Kendall was included in the Issues Matrix as well as a comment from Mr. Bob Yoder and the Master Builders Association of King and Snohomish County. All items have reached resolution which is reflected in the staff recommendations. All parties have been communicated with to ensure that the staff recommendation keeps the intent shared in comments.

> Chair Nichols closed the Public Hearing for both verbal and written comments.

Study Session

Ms. Dietz listed the issues still open in the Issues Matrix.

Item B-3 was the comment of Mr. Yoder, requesting a rezoning of R-1 to allow for the opportunity for more affordable housing and diversity. Staff recommended deferring to the Redmond 2050 project and the Housing Action Plan. The Redmond Zoning Code must remain consistent with policy that is in the Comprehensive Plan, while the zoning rewrite looks to change and update portions of the zoning code consistent with city policy. By changing a density provided in a zone, an inconsistency would be created, and the request is more in line with Redmond 2050 on a policy level. Mr. Yoder was satisfied with the recommendation of staff.

Chair Nichols stated that a list of items that belong in Redmond 2050 from previous discussions should be compiled with the recognition of consistency with the current Comprehensive Plan.

Commissioner Aparna asked Ms. Dietz how items being deferred were being captured for the Redmond 2050 or Housing Action Plan conversations, in example a master checklist. Ms. Dietz replied that a master checklist has been developed between Redmond 2050 and the Redmond Zoning Code. Ms. Dietz and Ms. Frey coordinate monthly to identify topics of interest.

Chair Nichols stated that issue B-3 could be closed, and the Commission agreed.

Item C-2 was the comment of Ms. Kendall regarding special regulations within non-residential allowed uses. The Technical Committee has recommended a simplification of non-residential uses. Within the Overlake neighborhood there was vagueness created by the simplification. Ms. Kendall realized that a special regulation limiting floor area to less than 75,000 square feet in a single use was meant to be applied to retail uses. Staff agrees that clarification is needed.

Ms. Kendall raised a comment regarding the Conditional Use Permit for gross floor area greater than 150,000 square feet that was intended for retail sales use also.

Ms. Kendall raised comments regarding definitions created to roll up use categories and classes. Staff agreed with recommendations but would like more time for the opportunity to work with Ms. Kendall to finalize wording. The Intent in comment is the staff recommendation but wording accuracy will continue to be explored. Ms. Kendall agrees with the approach.

September 22, 2021

Chair Nichols asked for clarification regarding staff needing more time. Ms. Dietz replied that final wording would be coordinated with Ms. Kendall to assure needs are met and would also be a part of the final recommendation of the Planning Commission. Commissioner Captain asked if there was a timeframe and Ms. Dietz replied when the Commission receives a draft final Commission report.

Chair Nichols expressed thanks to Ms. Kendall for reviewing the issues and the Commissioners agreed that the issue could be closed.

Item D-4 was a comment from the Master Builders of Snohomish and King County regarding Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU); to continue to remove occupancy requirements for short term rentals. The current recommendation before the Commission is to remove occupancy requirements for long-term rentals specifically, consistent with new State Law. Also requested was a relaxation of parking requirements on a case-by-case basis for site configurations such as shared parking opportunities. The change would require community conversations to discuss benefits and risks, and staff recommended deferring to Redmond 2050 and the Housing Action Plan. By deferring, the city can also monitor changes taking place based on new State Laws and to review the remaining supply of parking and changes to demand as different types of housing units are built.

Commissioner Captain asked if an individual who builds an ADU is required to occupy in Redmond, and if the unit cannot be rented to a third party. Ms. Dietz replied that currently the individual is required to occupy the primary unit or the ADU depending on the length of the rental. The change to State Law is that the owner would no longer need to live onsite. The City recommendation for short term rentals is to create more flexibility. In the short term, the owner would be required to live onsite. Commissioner Captain asked if a short-term rental would include an Airbnb situation and Ms. Dietz replied that the city is not regulating at that level at this time.

Ms. Pyle added a clarification that the home occupancy requirement by the homeowner stays in place for short-term. If the homeowner will not have someone in either the main home or ADU under a signed lease for more than 12 months at a time, the homeowner is required to live on the property in the main home for at least 51% of the year. The homeowner is not required to live on the property or in either dwelling units if there is a signed lease on file for 12 months or longer.

Commissioner Aparna asked why parking considerations should be deferred if to be determined on a case-by-case basis. Ms. Dietz replied that concerns over the years regarding increased parking in surrounding neighborhoods are held by neighbors and if an ADU does not have a requirement for parking on the lot, the issue grows. If the change were to be applied city-wide, more concern could be created, and a deferral will allow additional time to study the scenario. Limited scenarios were examined while analyzing State legislation and the conclusion was that there are places in the community where a parking lot provides parking off the street. Ms. Pyle added that a case-by-case judgement would need to meet every other requirement for an ADU that would not have parking; an alternative could be a joint use easement or parking agreement with a

September 22, 2021

neighbor with ample parking or with a neighboring business. The idea is valuable and needs to be investigated further. Lowering the barrier of parking requirements city-wide needs to be analyzed with proximity to frequent transit service. The current proposal is the result of an analysis covering a large area but not all. Service changes will occur in the next few years which will expand transit opportunities in some areas and reduce in others. Trail connections and complete walking paths are also considerations. Staff needs to address concerns and meet with to educate the community on outcomes of legislation, changes, and balancing public use of Rights of Way. Master Builders were told that staff did not believe there is ample time to cover all components of the conversation, but the importance is agreed, and the Master Builders were satisfied.

Commissioner Shefrin asked what has been proposed at the State level. Ms. Dietz replied that there were a series of amendments in Commissioner packets that have resulted from State legislation, senior housing, affordable housing, and multi-family housing. When located in walkable proximity to transit, within a quarter mile, a reduction in required parking ratio is granted. Previously, a similar amendment for ADUs was approved in the annual Code Clean-Up and part of Re-Write Phase One.

Commissioner Captain stated that reality is that some households have three or four cars needing parking space, and a cul-de-sac is a particular problem. When an ADU is allowed, no consideration to the consequences of extra vehicles is given.

Chair Nichols asked if the issue could be closed, and the Commissioners agreed.

Item E-2 was regarding Town Center and the Commissioners seeking clarification regarding changes proposed to the incentive program. Ms. Pyle displayed slides explaining language used. Changes remove private entitlement language while keeping intent and new developments will require a robust Master Planning and Development Agreement process.

Ms. Pyle continued that Ms. Kendall had provided other comments, some related to the incentive table. Most were minor clarifications where there was confusion, and staff either accepted the changes or re-worded to meet in the middle to keep the original incentive. Additional comments from Ms. Kendall were regarding mapping, minor language, and design elements. Staff shared with Ms. Kendall that design requests exceed the scope of the clean-up amendments and the incentive package, and already planned as part of the Phase Three Re-Write to update all design standards.

Commissioner Aparna stated the issue could be closed.

Item E-4 from Ms. Kendall was regarding Floor Area Ratio (FAR). The Technical Committee recommendation was to simplify the FAR calculation and tables in Overlake and Marymoor Village aligned to residential, non-residential and in some cases hotel. Ms. Kendall suggested that the FAR for non-residential be treated as additive, but this was not the original intent when the language was created. Staff had recommended to maintain the original Technical Committee recommendations; however, Ms. Kendall submitted additional comment and provided two different scenarios giving staff an

September 22, 2021

opportunity to look more closely at how FAR functions today. Staff recommends accepting the Per Use Class Addition to the table for Floor Area.

The Commission agreed to close the issue.

Item H-1 from Vice Chair East concerned transit route changes in a neighborhood with reduced parking due to previous access proximity to transit. Staff found that any reductions would occur primarily in Downtown, Overlake, Marymoor Village, and along primary arterials. The future pattern of transit appears present a lower likelihood of any transit stops being removed due to increasing density.

Vice Chair East appreciated the effort by staff and stated that the item could be closed.

Item I-1 from the Commissioners concerned moving an affordable local commercial incentive from second tier to the top tier. Ms. Dietz stated that staff has recommended to maintain the original tiered system as per the Technical Committee. Mr. Lee explained tier requirements. Affordable local commercial is experimental in nature at this point but can be moved into the first tier of incentives after affordable local commercial has taken hold with better information for implementing in the future.

Commissioner Aparna asked if requirements in a tier all are to be accomplished or if one requirement can be chosen, as LEED Zero and affordable housing do not go together. Mr. Lee replied that the only stand-alone is LEED Zero incentives. If doing LEED Zero, affordable housing or green building components do not apply; however, if not doing LEED Zero, another LEED program certification and affordable housing would be required. Commissioner Aparna asked if Tier I would be LEED or affordable housing currently, or affordable commercial if added. Mr. Lee replied correct, LEED Zero stands alone while if any other is chosen, all three others are requirements.

Commissioner Aparna stated that the city should use caution in using LEED Zero Energy or Carbon as they are not complete programs. There are better Zero Carbon programs available. LEED Zero takes the shortest way and studies show to be not as effective. The Living Building Challenge has a Zero Carbon protocol and Architecture 2030 has a Zero code. Commissioner Aparna offered to provide a list to staff if interested. The term A Zero Carbon Protocol could be used to keep the item broad. LEED Zero is less than the best. LEED Zero is not a green neighborhood protocol. Mr. Lee replied that the term net zero requires a lot of land and stated that proposed code language reads LEED Zero or LEED equivalent program. LEED is a name-brand understandable program that most people have heard of. Commissioner Aparna stated that if the city does want to come across as serious, other names might be added as while LEED is recognizable to people, industry realized there are more effective protocols. LEED Zero offers offsets for everything and offsets are not sustainable. The Living Building Challenge is based in Seattle and would be happy to talk to the Commission.

Chair Nichols asked if the issue could remain open. Commissioner Captain stated that because a program has a brand image in the market does not mean the program is the best available and agreed that the issue should be kept open.

September 22, 2021

Ms. Pyle stated that community and council are anticipated to continue to desire prioritization of green building techniques and lower carbon options and appreciated the comment of Commissioner Aparna regarding Zero Carbon Protocol. Ms. Pyle asked if the direction desired would be for LEED Zero and other programs to be listed as examples of ways to achieve, prioritizing the outcome versus a specific program. Commissioner Aparna replied that the approach would be great but cautioned that Zero Carbon and Net Zero Carbon have many definitions and for clarity the definition desired will need to be pinned down. Zero Carbon can be approached from both an operational standpoint and from embodied carbon in materials. Commissioner Aparna stated that a list of systems and definitions would be forwarded to staff in the coming days. Ms. Pyle acknowledged concerns and stated that offering an array of examples that achieve the definition would be helpful. Commissioner Aparna stated that in a separate conversation, what would be layered over code as opposed to options could make a difference in certification costs.

Chair Nichols stated that the item would be kept open.

Ms. Dietz reviewed next steps within the Commission schedule and asked if there were further questions.

Chair Nichols stated that the ARCH Executive Board has taken action that may need to be addressed in the package; 91% of ARCH tenants use parking spaces on the property but with unbundling throughout the Eastside, this becomes a cost issue for the affordable housing tenants. The ARCH Executive Board voted to approve the recommendation of a \$125 monthly parking allowance option for developers in projects with less than one stall per unit with adjustments based on CPI and market surveys. Redmond housing regulations and definitions should reflect the costs. Ms. Dietz replied that staff is also aware and that the item can be included in the Issues Matrix if desired.

The item was not advertised to be addressed for the Public Hearing portion, so an additional public hearing would be needed; noticing for an additional Public Hearing requires 21-day notice, putting the Public Hearing on October 20, 2021 (See Staff and Commissioner Updates, moved to October 27, 2021).

The Commissioners agreed that the item should be added to the Issues Matrix. Ms. Dietz stated that therefore there would not be a Redmond Zoning Code Rewrite Phase 1 and Zoning Code Amendments 2020-2021 Study Session agenda item on September 29, 2021.

6. Planning Commission Annual Workshop - Topics. Discussion of potential topics for the Planning Commission Annual Workshop to be held October 20, 2021.

Chair Nichols stated that the Workshop would be held virtually and asked for topics that the Commission would like to learn more about.

September 22, 2021

Commissioner Knopf asked for clarification regarding green buildings. Commissioner Aparna offered to give a short presentation.

Commissioner Captain stated that suggestions for other topics would be forwarded to Mr. Coil in the coming days.

Ms. Frey stated that workshop agenda would include a look ahead and other suggestions could be how the Sustainability Action Plan Advisory Committee interacts with what the Planning Commission is doing and other projects. Mr. Coil stated that Ms. Jenny Lybeck is available to discuss environmental sustainability in the context of informing Commission work and that Ms. Cecilia Martinez-Vasquez, Program Manager for Diversity Equity and Inclusion is also potentially available. Mr. Coil asked if these should be listed as potential topics and Chair Nichols replied yes. Ms. Frey stated that the agenda and resources would be prepared.

Ms. Frey asked if the Commissioners wanted to limit the agenda to those topics, since that would be a full agenda. The Commissioners agreed.

7. Staff & Commissioner Updates

> Updates and discussion only. No action will be taken at this time.

Mr. Coil stated that there would be a meeting on September 29, 2021 and Tree Regulations will begin their review during that meeting. Commissioner Captain asked for clarification on the September 29, 2021 meeting that only the item of Ms. Dietz was being removed from that meeting date. Mr. Coil replied yes there is a meeting on the 29th. Mr. Coil stated that there would also be a Redmond 2050 monthly update in addition to the Tree Regulations.

Mr. Coil continued that for the month of October there will be three meetings: a meeting on October 13, the Planning Commission's Annual Workshop will be on the October 20, and a meeting on October 27. Chair Nichols asked for clarification if a Public Hearing would be on October 20, per Ms. Dietz's comment earlier. Ms. Frey replied that a Public Hearing would not be held on that date due to the Annual Workshop and that she would coordinate with Ms. Dietz to schedule the Public Hearing to the next regular meeting on October 27, 2021.

8. Adjourn - 8:41pm

Minutes approved on:

9/13/2021

Planning Commission Chair

Sherri Mchols